

launch military attacks except in response to a direct attack on our country, nor can it limit the President's authority as Commander in Chief once Congress does authorize war.

I believe the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force in Iraq was a colossal mistake. It created a dangerous power vacuum. It was never supported with the full resources of the United States, and it was without provocation.

But there should be no rewriting of history here. It might have been George W. Bush who advocated for the war and Bush, Obama, and now President Trump who have waged it, but it was Congress' adoption of the AUMF that formally started it.

And once started, only the President can wage it. President Trump inherited this mess and history will judge how well he handles it. Certainly, in this instance, the President not only had clear and unambiguous authority to order the attack, he had a moral imperative to do so.

What is crystal clear from the debate yesterday is that if the Democrats had had their way, Soleimani would be alive today, and the attack on American troops that he was in the final stages of planning would have unfolded. We would likely, today, be mourning very many American casualties.

If the President, knowing that this attack was coming and in full possession of the opportunity and the authority to stop it, had taken the Democrats' advice and done nothing, he would have been deeply culpable for the loss of these Americans. It is shocking to me, and perhaps to the country as well, that even in hindsight this is the course the Democrats have made clear that they prefer.

That brings me to the nature of the resolution that the House passed yesterday. The separation of war powers between the legislative and executive branches has been badly blurred in recent decades, and I do believe that we need to reestablish not only the constitutional principles that separate the declaring of war from the waging of war, but also the American tradition that we only go to war when we have been attacked.

When we must go to war, we have the utmost obligation to put the entire might and resources and attention of the Nation behind it, and to get it over with just as quickly as possible.

Now, that is a legitimate debate to have, but that is not what the House did yesterday. Yesterday, it deliberately and recklessly undermined the position of the United States Government and the United States Armed Forces that we sent to Iraq, shredding the tradition that politics stop at the water's edge.

In a perilous moment, the House refused to stand behind the war that it had authorized in 2002, refused to protect the men and women that it placed in harm's way, and it gave a hostile

foreign power a major propaganda victory.

That is yet another stain upon the honor of this House, and one which should be deplored and condemned through the ages to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IMPOSING SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ADDITIONAL SECTORS OF IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") with respect to Iran that takes additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

The order takes steps to deny Iran revenue, including revenue derived from the export of products from key sectors of Iran's economy, that may be used to fund and support its nuclear program, missile development, terrorism and terrorist proxy networks, and malign regional influence.

The order blocks the property and interests in property of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

to operate in the construction, mining, manufacturing, or textiles sectors of the Iranian economy, or any other sector of the Iranian economy as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State;

to have knowingly engaged, on or after the date of the order, in a significant transaction for the sale, supply, or transfer to or from Iran of significant goods or services used in connection with a sector of the Iranian economy specified in, or determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, pursuant to, section 1(a)(i) of the order;

to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

The order also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation

with the Secretary of State, to impose correspondent account and payable-through account-related sanctions on a foreign financial institution upon determining the foreign financial institution has, on or after the date of the order, knowingly conducted or facilitated a significant financial transaction:

for the sale, supply, or transfer to or from Iran of significant goods or services used in connection with a sector of the Iranian economy specified in, or determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, pursuant to, section 1(a)(i) of the order; or

for or on behalf of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to section 1 of the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to take such actions, including adopting rules and regulations, to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to implement the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 2020.

WEAPONIZATION OF LANGUAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, because this is the 1-year anniversary of the date that a disparaging misquote in *The New York Times* was posted, January 10 of 2019, this being January 10 of 2020.

I am hopeful that this new year we have, 2020, will bring about some clarity of vision on the part of my colleagues, the American people, and I don't know that I have as much hope for the press. But this day, a year ago today, I was misquoted by *The New York Times*. The *Times* alleged that I had used three terms and asked, why does that language become offensive?

Well, the truth is that it was a 56-minute telephone interview, a call on my cell phone. I didn't have a way to tape it. But I have a practice over the years, I have done interviews with any kind of media I can think of, and if I don't have a means to tape what I say to them, I make it a point not to repeat anything, say anything that I haven't already said to the press. That way, there is nothing new out there for them to take and manipulate it in the article.

□ 1300

When that phone rang that morning on the 5th of January, 2019, if that is a